

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Keyshon Poinsette,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 2:25-cv-416-BHH
v.	)	
	)	<b><u>ORDER</u></b>
National Credit System,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff Keyshon Poinsette's ("Plaintiff") pro se complaint. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B), D.S.C., the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary review.

On March 24, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a proper form order giving Plaintiff the opportunity to bring the case into proper form for evaluation and possible service of process. (ECF No. 7.) Ultimately, however, the time for Plaintiff to bring his case into proper form expired, and Plaintiff has not provided the necessary documents to bring his case into proper form.

Accordingly, on May 23, 2025, the Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendation ("Report"), outlining the issues and recommending that the Court summarily dismiss this action without prejudice pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. (ECF No. 13.) Attached to the Magistrate Judge's Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of the right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. To date, no objections have been filed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final

determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because no objections to the Report have been filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s analysis. **Accordingly, the Court adopts and incorporates the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 13), and the Court dismisses this action without prejudice in accordance with Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks  
United States District Judge

June 16, 2025  
Charleston, South Carolina